



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,805	09/29/2003	Jacob Oshins	MS301930.1/MSFTP381US	2203

27195 7590 10/07/2005

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

PHAN, RAYMOND NGAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/673,805	Applicant(s) OSHINS, JACOB	
	Examiner Raymond Phan	Art Unit 2111	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03222004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-34 are pending.
2. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 2111.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

5. Claims 1-11, 17-18, 21-23, 27-30, 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Laurenti (US No. 6,502,152).

In regard to claims 1, 27, 33, 34, Laurenti discloses an interrupt arbitration system, comprising: at least one request associated with an interrupt resource, the

request including at least two dimensions related to an interrupt and an interrupt service component (see col. 11, lines 5-11); and at least one arbiter to process the request and return a subset of interrupt resource ranges in view of available system resources (see col. 13, line 57 through col. 14, line 11).

In regard to claim 2, Laurenti discloses further comprising a requesting component that communicates to the arbiter in order to determine available system resources that may be utilized by the requesting component to perform one or more tasks (see col. 13, line 57 through col. 14, lines 11).

In regard to claim 3, Laurenti discloses the system resources are related to at least one of I/O ports, memory locations, DMA channels (Direct Memory Access), bus numbers, and interrupt requests (IRQs) (see table 8).

In regard to claim 4, Laurenti discloses further comprising at least one arbiter for a respective system resource (see col. 18, line 65 through col. 19, line 32).

In regard to claim 5, Laurenti discloses the system resources are associated with one or more system devices, buses, or other components which are negotiated for via the at least one arbiter (see col. 12, lines 28-58).

In regard to claim 6, Laurenti discloses the requesting component issues a multidimensional interrupt request (IRQ) associated with one or more interrupt inputs, signals, or assignments, the IRQ is employed to interrupt at least one processing component (see col. 11, lines 5-11).

In regard to claim 7, Laurenti discloses the interrupt service component is associated with an Interrupt Descriptor Table (IDT) entry that is concurrently mapped with an IRQ (see col. 11, lines 5-19).

In regard to claim 8, Laurenti discloses the IRQ is mapped in accordance with a first request and the IDT entry is mapped in accordance with a separate request (see col. 11, lines 5-19).

In regard to claim 9, Laurenti discloses the arbiter performs an analysis of system resources, and if requested interrupt resources are found to be available, the arbiter returns a resource subset or data packet indicating the interrupt resources that can be utilized by a requesting component (see col. 13, line 56 through col. 14, line 4).

In regard to claim 10, Laurenti disclose if the interrupt resources are not deemed available by the arbiter, a code or flag is returned to the requesting component indicating that requested interrupt resources cannot be satisfied (see col. 19, lines 4-32).

In regard to claim 11, Laurenti discloses the request further comprising at least one other dimension including a time component (i.e. priority) (see col. 17, line 56 through col. 18, line 65).

In regard to claim 17, Laurenti discloses further comprising a control component to tune performance of a machine by influencing interrupt assignment policy (see col. 19, lines 4-53).

In regard to claim 18, Laurenti discloses further comprising a monitor component to provide feedback to the control component regarding system performance (see col. 19, lines 4-53).

In regard to claims 21, 29, Laurenti discloses the interrupt is associated with at least one of a local bus, a system bus, a PCI bus, and an ISA bus (see col. 4, lines 9-51).

In regard to claim 22, Laurenti discloses the interrupt is at least one of derived from at least two components and coupled to one or more devices that are associated with one or more buses (see col. 12, lines 1-18).

In regard to claim 23, Laurenti discloses further comprising at least one bus adaptor to communicate between buses (see col. 12, lines 1-18).

In regard to claim 28, Laurenti disclose the method for arbitrating the interrupt resources, comprising: determining a an interrupt range for an interrupt request (see col. 13, lines 56-67); determining an interrupt table entry for the interrupt range (see col. 13, lines 64 through col. 14, ine 11); and concurrently assigning the interrupt range and the interrupt table in response to the interrupt request and in view of available system resources (see col. 13, line 56 through col. 14, line 11).

In regard to claim 30, Laurenti disclose determining if the interrupts are shared by more than one device (se col. 11, lines 5-52).

In regard to claim 32, Laurenti disclose further matching interrupt properties of at least two devices (see col. 11, lines 4-52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject mattersought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 12-16, 19-20, 24-26, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurenti in view of Bonola (US NO. 6,370,606).

In regard to claim 12, Laurenti discloses the claimed subject matter as discussed above rejection except the teaching of the requesting component is a

Plug and Play (PnP) manager that communicates with individual plug-in modules which decide which resources can be assigned to specific devices. However Bonola disclose the requesting component is a Plug and Play (PnP) manager that communicates with individual plug-in modules which decide which resources can be assigned to specific devices (see col. 5, lines 12-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the rapid development of a new generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

In regard to claim 13, Bonola disclose further comprising a driver that supplies an arbiter to arbitrate interrupts (see col. 9, lines 6-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the rapid development of a new generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

In regard to claim 14, Bonola discloses the arbiter includes an interface associated with a function related to at least one of the following: testing/analyzing whether a possible set of resources operate (see col. 9, line 65 through col. 10, line 36); committing a specific set of resources that has been requested by a PnP manager (see col. 10, lines 9-46); querying for a set of devices that conflict with a resource set (see col. 11, lines 4-16); and marking resources that were in use by an operating system component when a machine is booted (see col. 11, lines 4-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the rapid development of a new

generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

In regard to claim 15, Bonola discloses the arbiter is associated with a library function (see col. 12, lines 21-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the rapid development of a new generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

In regard to claim 16, Bonola discloses the library function is associated with a FindSuitableRange function that searches across available IRQs and available IDT entries (see col. 12, lines 21-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the rapid development of a new generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

In regard to claim 19, Bonola discloses the interrupt is a Message-Signaled Interrupts (MSI) (see col. 9, lines 39-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the rapid development of a new generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

In regard to claim 20, Bonola discloses further comprising at least one of the following Application Programming Interfaces: IoConnectInterruptEx, and IoDisconnectInterruptEx, IRQ_ARBITER_INTERFACE (see col. 12, lines 21-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the rapid development of a new generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

In regard to claim 24, Bonola discloses further comprising at least one local Advanced Programmable Interrupt Controller (APIC) that processes interrupts directed to a processor and an I/O APIC that collects interrupts from devices outside the processor (see col. 9, lines 56-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the rapid development of a new generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

In regard to claims 25, 31, Bonola discloses further comprising at least one of a link node to multiplex a plurality of interrupts (see col. 10, lines 25-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the rapid development of a new generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

In regard to claim 26, Bonola discloses further comprising at least one user-mode component and at least one kernel-mode component to arbitrate an interrupt (see col. 4, lines 40-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Bonola within the system of Laurenti because it would facilitate the

rapid development of a new generation of portable and intelligent I/O solutions for personal computers or workstations.

Conclusion

8. All claims are rejected.
9. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Losi (US No. 6,470,407) discloses a method for arbitrating interrupt priorities among peripherals in a microprocessor based system.

Beckert et al. (US No. 6,499,078) disclose an interrupt handler with prioritized interrupt vector generator.

Hober et al. (US No. 6,865,636) disclose a multitasking processor system with monitoring interrupt events.

Alexander et al. (US No. 6,877,057) disclose an information handling system with dynamic interrupt allocation apparatus and method.

Christie et al. (US No. 6,378,023) disclose an interrupt description cache for a microprocessor.

Webber (US No. 6,412,035) discloses an apparatus and method for decreasing the response times of interrupt service routines.

Hammalund et al. (US Pub No. 2005/0027914) disclose an inter-processor interrupts.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Primary, Paul Myers can be reached on (571) 272-3639 or via e-mail addressed to paul.myers@uspto.gov. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 central telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

REP



TIM VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Raymond Phan
Sept 26, 2005